

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action mailed May 13, 2009, claims 1 and 3-6 were rejected. In response, Applicants hereby request reconsideration of the application in view of the proposed amendment and the below-provided remarks. No claims are amended or added. Claims 5 and 6 are canceled.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph

Claims 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as purportedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. In particular, the Office Action states that claims 5 and 6 each recite “the receiver signal strength indication circuit comprises an integrated circuit,” but that “according to the specification paragraph 1, the integrated tuner comprises the RSSI circuit.” Additionally, the Office Action states that claim 5 recites “the memory means is placed on the RSSI circuit,” but that paragraph 15 of the specification only recites the memory is separate from the integrated tuner. Furthermore, the Office Action state that claim 6 recites “the memory means is integrated into the integrated tuner,” but that paragraph 15 only recites the possibility of integrating memory into the integrated tuner. Applicants appreciate the Examiner’s observation; however, claims 5 and 6 are canceled. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections under U.S.C 112, first paragraph, are moot.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katsura et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,683,925, hereinafter Katsura) in view of Jacques et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0048267, hereinafter Jacques). Additionally, claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katsura as modified by Jacques in view of Lampe et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,852,772, hereinafter Lampe). However, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are patentable over Katsura, Jacques, and Lampe for the reasons provided below.

Independent Claim 1

Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over the combination of Katsura and Jacques because the combination of cited references does not teach all of the limitations of the claim. Claim 1 recites:

A receiver signal strength indication circuit receiving a discretely controlled amplified signal from an amplifying means (A1-A4), the circuit comprising:

narrow filter means coupled to an output of the discretely controlled amplifying means (A1-A4), said narrow filter means providing a limited spectrum of the input signal;

logarithmic detector means for receiving and logarithmically amplifying an output of the narrow filter;

analog-to-digital (ADC) means for converting the output of the logarithmic detector to a digital receiver signal strength indication; and

memory means to store an amplification setting of the discretely controlled amplifying means relative to a first radio-frequency (RF) input level and the digital receiver signal strength indication, wherein the stored amplification setting is configured to serve as a reference to tune the circuit for a subsequent RF input level.

In contrast, the combination of Katsura and Jacques does not teach all of the limitations of the claim because the combination of cited references does not teach a narrow filter means coupled to an output of the discretely controlled amplifying means and a logarithmic detector receiving and logarithmically amplifying the output of the narrow filter. For reference, the Office Action relies solely on Katsura as teaching the indicated language of the claim. Hence, the Office Action does not rely on Jacques as purportedly teaching the indicated limitation.

In particular, the Office Action states that the low-pass filter 7 of Katsura teaches the narrow filter of claim 1. However, a low-pass filter is not equivalent to a narrow filter. Generally, there are three types of frequency filters: low-pass filters, high-pass filters, and band-pass filters. Low-pass and high-pass filters each include a single cut-off frequency. Low-pass filters include a low-pass cut-off frequency. Frequencies above the low-pass cut-off frequency attenuate, whereas frequencies below the low-pass cut-off frequency pass through. High-pass filters include a high-pass cut-off frequency. Frequencies above the high-pass cut-off frequency pass through, whereas frequencies

below the high-pass cut-off frequency attenuate. In contrast to low- and high-pass filters, a band-pass filter includes two cut-off frequencies, a high cut-off frequency and a low cut-off frequency. Frequencies below the low cut-off frequency and above the high cut-off frequency attenuate, whereas frequencies between the low and high cut-off frequencies pass through the band-pass filter. The presence of two cut-off frequencies and the ability to pass frequencies between the cut-off frequencies are what define the band-pass filter as a “narrow” filter. In contrast, low-pass filters are not narrow filters because low-pass filters pass all frequencies below the low-pass cut-off frequency. Similarly, high-pass frequencies are not narrow filters because high-pass frequencies pass all frequencies above the high-pass cut-off frequency.

While the details of the specification are not read into the limitations of the claim, the specification describes the narrow filter as a band-pass filter with “‘narrow’ band selectivity.” Present Application, page 1, line 20; *and see* page 3. Additionally, the symbol within the narrow filter element NF depicted in Fig. 1 depicts the narrow filter element as a band-pass filter. Present Application, Fig. 1. Hence, this understanding of a “narrow” filter is consistent with the description in the specification of the present application.

In contrast, the filter 7 of Katsura is a low-pass filter. Since the filter 7 of Katsura is a low-pass filter, the filter 7 of Katsura is not a narrow filter. It should be noted that Katsura does portray a band-pass filter 4. Katsura, Fig. 11. However, Katsura does not offer a description of the band-pass filter 4. Moreover, Fig. 11 of Katsura does not portray the band-pass filter 4 coupled to an output of a discretely controlled amplifying means and a logarithmic detector receiving and logarithmically amplifying the output of the band-pass filter 4. Hence, Katsura does not teach the indicated limitation.

For the reasons presented above, the combination of Katsura and Jacques does not teach all of the limitations of the claim because Katsura does not teach a narrow filter means coupled to an output of the discretely controlled amplifying means and a logarithmic detector receiving and logarithmically amplifying the output of the narrow filter. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert claim 1 is patentable over the proposed combination of Katsura and Jacques.

Dependent Claims

Claims 3-6 depend from and incorporate all of the limitations of independent claim 1. Applicants respectfully assert claims 3-6 are allowable based on an allowable base claim. Additionally, each of claims 3-6 may be allowable for further reasons.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the proposed amendments and the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account **50-4019** pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.25. Additionally, please charge any fees to Deposit Account **50-4019** under 37 C.F.R. 1.16, 1.17, 1.19, 1.20 and 1.21.

Respectfully submitted,

/mark a. wilson/

Mark A. Wilson
Reg. No. 43,994

Wilson & Ham
PMB: 348
2530 Berryessa Road
San Jose, CA 95132
Phone: (925) 249-1300
Fax: (925) 249-0111

Date: June 9, 2009